REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24 and 26-38 were pending in this application. In this amendment, claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 29, 30 and 34 are amended, and claims 39-45 are added. Accordingly claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24, and 26-45 are now presented for examination and allowance. No new matter has been added, support for the amendments is found throughout the application, see for example, paragraphs 26-35.

Claims Objected to for Informalities

In the pending Office Action, claim 21 is objected to because the claim recited "...parameters the include..." at line 3. Applicant has amended claim 21 to recite "... parameters that include ..." as suggested by the Examiner, and therefore applicant requests that the objection to claim 21 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

In the pending Office Action, claims 12-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As amended, claim 12 recites a computer readable media embodying a program of instructions that defines the structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the other elements of the computer and produces a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Claim 12 recites a computer program that receives an origination request for a call, including parameters that include a service parameter and a dialing string. The computer program determines which communications networks from a plurality of available communications networks support the call based upon the parameters, thereby identifying compatible networks. The computer program accesses predetermined information and compares it to the dialing string to determine if the call is allowed on at least one of the compatible networks. Then the computer program originates the call over a compatible if it is determined the call is allowed, or prevents the call from being originated if the call is determined not to be allowed.

Claim 12 recites structural and functional relationships between the computer program and the other elements of the computer that are receiving, determining, and accessing, that produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result of originating or preventing the call. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 recites statutory subject matter. Likewise, claims 13-15, and 17-20 depend from claim 12, and for at least the reasons given

above also recite statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the pending Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-24, 29-30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,283 to Kolev, et al ("Kolev").

Kolev describes techniques to "resolve the problem of multi-mode mobile terminal service selection protocols where a subscriber identification has been determined to be invalid." (Kolev col. 3, lines 7-10). Kolev describes that a terminal accesses different networks depending on a subscriber identity and if the network allows access without a valid subscriber identity. For example, Kolev describes:

> The mobile terminal includes a transceiver means for communicating over a first and a second wireless communication network. The terminal further includes means for determining if the first network allows access without a valid subscriber identity and if the second network allows access without a valid subscriber identity. In addition, the mobile terminal includes a means for determining if the subscriber identity of the mobile terminal is valid for the first network or the second network. Finally, the mobile terminal includes means for controlling the transceiver means so as to communicate over a select one of the first or the second network which allows access without a valid subscriber identity if the subscriber identity of the mobile terminal is invalid in both the first network and the second network.
>
> (Kolev, col. 3, lines 41-55)

Independent claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 29, 30, and 34 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. No new matter has been added, see for example, paragraphs 26-35 of the original specification. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite determining which communications networks from a plurality of communication networks support a call based upon parameters that include a service parameter and a dialing string, thereby identifying compatible networks, and then accessing predefined information and comparing the dialing string to the information to determine if the call is allowed on at least one of the compatible networks, and if so, originating the call. Claims 10, 12, 21, 29, 30, and 34 include similar limitations to claim 1.

The amendments to the claims are fully supported in the specification. For example, paragraph 30 recites that "[b]ased on the parameters derived from the user's call origination request, the call manager 304 determines whether the call is allowed on each of the various networks." Also, paragraph 35 recites that predefined information "such as fixed dialing lists, blocked call lists, or other user-defined information is accessed for the purpose of comparing the dialing string to the information and determining whether the call is allowed."

In contrast to Kolev which describes selecting a network based on whether or not a subscriber identity is valid or invalid and the network services available to the terminal, claim 1 recites determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and then determining if the call is allowed based on predefined information compared with the dialing string. In other words, once Kolev determines that a network supports the services needed by the terminal then the network is selected. Unlike Kolev, claim 1 determines if the call is supported on the network and if the call is allowed on the network based on predefined information, and then if both of these are satisfied the call is originated on the network.

Determining if a call is allowed on a compatible network offers many advantages: for example, a parent may provide a wireless communication device to a child that is programmed to only allow the child to call certain telephone numbers on desired networks (paragraph [0035], lines 6-9). Likewise, it may be desirable to restrict particular groups or categories of calls to specific networks, even if other available networks are compatible.

Thus, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Kolev. Claims 10, 12, 21, 29, 30 and 35 include similar limitations, and for similar reasons these claims are also patentable over Kolev. In addition, claims 2-9, 11, 13-20, 22-28, 31-34, and 36-40 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 30, and 35 respectively and, for at least the reasons given above, are also in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the pending Office Action, claims 6-7, 17-18, 26-27, 31-32 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of U.S. Patent 5,915,224 to Jonsson ("Jonsson").

Claims 6-7, 17-18, 26-27, 31-31, and 36-37 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, 21, 30, and 34 respectively. As discussed above, Kolev does not describe all of

the limitations recited in claims 1, 12, 21, 30, and 34 and the addition of Jonsson does not overcome this deficiency.

Jonsson describes that a "communications arrangement automatically selects the telecommunications network which is most dedicated for communication with the communications arrangement." (Jonsson Col. 4, lines 20-23). The communication arrangement "registers automatically a mobile terminal that belongs to the communications arrangement, in the selected network selected by the arrangement." (Jonsson Col. 4, lines 23-27). Also, the "communications arrangement manages diversion of incoming calls which as a destination use a directory number in one of the aforesaid number of different networks, to the network in which the mobile terminal is registered at that moment, without initiative on the part of a user." (Jonsson Col. 4, lines 27-32).

Thus, Jonsson does not describe determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and then determining if the call is allowed based on predefined information compared with the dialing string, as recited in claim 1. Even if it were possible to combine the teachings of Kolev and Jonsson the combination would not describe all of the limitations of claim 1. The combination would use Kolev's techniques to access a network then, after the network is access, Jonsson's communications arrangement would select the network which at that moment is most dedicated for communication with the communications arrangement. Thus, the combination, even if possible, would not describe determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and then determining if the call is allowed based on predefined information compared with the dialing string, as recited in claim 1. Claims 12, 21, 30, and 34 recite limitations similar to claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-7, 17-18, 26-27, 31-32 and 36-37 are patentable over Kolev and Jonsson, both individually and in combination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the pending Office Action, claims 8, 19, 28, 33 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of Jonsson and further in view of Sakai et al. U.S. Patent 7,010,296, hereinafter ("Sakai").

Claims 8, 19, 28, 33, and 38 depend indirectly from claims 1, 12, 21, 30, and 34 respectively. As discussed above, Kolev and Jonsson do not describe all of the limitations

recited in claims 1, 12, 21, 30, and 34 and the addition of Sakai does not overcome this deficiency.

Sakai describes "a method of registering services which is based on a simple control procedure so as to achieve prompt processing when a communication-service terminal requests service registration in a foreign communication-service provider network." (Sakai, Col. 3, lines 27-32). Sakai goes on to describe that the method "allows the mobile-communication terminal to identify a service code of the foreign communication-service provider corresponding to a service code of the given communication-service provider when the service code of the given communication-service provider is entered in the mobile-communication terminal." (Sakai, col. 3, lines 61-66).

Thus, Sakai does not describe determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and then determining if the call is allowed based on predetermined information compared with the dialing string, as recited in claim 1. Even if it were possible to combine the teachings of Kolev and Jonsson with the teachings of Sakai, the combination would not describe all of the limitations of claim 1. The combination would use Kolev's techniques to access a network, then after the network is accessed, Jonsson's communications arrangement would select the network that at that moment is most dedicated for communication with the communications arrangement, and then if the terminal requests service registration in a foreign communication-service-provider network, it would use Sakai's techniques. Thus, the combination, even if possible, would not describe determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and then determining if the call is allowed based on predefined information compared with the dialing string, as recited in claim 1. Claims 12, 21, 30, and 34 recite limitations similar to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24 and 26-38, are patentable over the references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 22, 2007

By: /James D. McFarland/
James D. McFarland
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,544

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779
Telephone: (858) 658-5928
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502